arXiv:1510.00997v2 [math.GR] 18 Jul 2016

Non-separability and complete reducibility: E_n examples with an application to a question of Külshammer

Tomohiro Uchiyama
Department of Mathematics, University of Auckland,
Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand
email:tuch540@aucklanduni.ac.nz

Abstract

Let G be a simple algebraic group of type $E_n (n = 6, 7, 8)$ defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 2. We present examples of triples of closed reductive groups $H < M < G$ such that H is G-completely reducible, but not M-completely reducible. As an application, we consider a question of Külshammer on representations of finite groups in reductive groups. We also consider a rationality problem for G-complete reducibility and a problem concerning conjugacy classes.

Keywords: algebraic groups, separable subgroups, complete reducibility, representations of finite groups

1 Introduction

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic p. In [17, Sec. 3], J.P. Serre defined the following:

Definition 1.1. A closed subgroup H of G is *G-completely reducible* (G-cr for short) if whenever H is contained in a parabolic subgroup P of G, H is contained in a Levi subgroup L of P.

This is a faithful generalization of the notion of semisimplicity in representation theory: if $G = GL_n(k)$, a subgroup H of G is G-cr if and only if H acts semisimply on k^n [17, Ex. 3.2.2(a)]. If $p = 0$, the notion of G-complete reducibility agrees with the notion of reductivity [17, Props. 4.1, 4.2]. In this paper, we assume $p > 0$. In that case, if a subgroup H is G-cr, then H is reductive [17, Prop. 4.1], but the other direction fails: take H to be a unipotent subgroup of order p of $G = SL_2$. See [20] for examples of connected non-G-cr subgroups. In this paper, by a subgroup of G, we always mean a closed subgroup.

Completely reducible subgroups have been much studied as important ingredients to understand the subgroup structure of connected reductive algebraic groups [12], [13], [21]. Recently, studies of complete reducibility via Geometric Invariant Theory (GIT for short) have been fruitful [3], [4], [2]. In this paper, we use a recent result from GIT (Proposition 2.4).

Here is the first problem we consider in this paper. Let $H < M < G$ be a triple of reductive algebraic groups. It is known to be hard to find such a triple with H G-cr but not M-cr [3], [22]. The only known such examples are [3, Sec. 7] for $p = 2, G = G_2$ and [22] for $p = 2, G = E_7$. Recall that a pair of reductive groups G and M is called a *reductive pair* if Lie M is an M-module direct summand of $\mathfrak{g}$. For more on reductive pairs, see [8]. Our main result is:

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a simple algebraic group of type E_6 (respectively E_7, E_8) of any isogeny type defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 2. Then there exist reductive subgroups $H < M$ of G such that H is finite, M is semisimple of type A_5A_1 (respectively A_7, D_8), (G, M) is a reductive pair, and H is G-cr but not M-cr.*

In this paper, we present new examples with the properties of Theorem 1.2 giving an explicit description of the mechanism for generating such examples. We give 11 examples for $G = E_6$, 1 new example for $G = E_7$, and 2 examples for $G = E_8$. We use Magma [5] for our computations. Recall that G-complete reducibility is invariant under isogenies [2, Lem. 2.12]; in Sections 3,4, and 5, we do computations for simply-connected G only, but that is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.2 for G of any isogeny type.

We recall a few relevant definitions and results from [3], [22], which motivated our work. We denote the Lie algebra of G by $\operatorname{Lie} G = \mathfrak{g}$.

Definition 1.3. Let H and N be subgroups of G where H acts on N by group automorphisms. The action of H is called *separable* in N if the global centralizer of H in N agrees with the infinitesimal centralizer of H in Lie N, that is, $C_N(H) = \mathfrak{c}_{\operatorname{Lie} N}(H)$. Note that the condition means that the set of fixed points of H acting on N, taken with its natural scheme structure, is smooth.

This is a slight generalization of the notion of separable subgroups. Recall that

Definition 1.4. Let H be a subgroup of G acting on G by inner automorphisms. Let H act on $\mathfrak{g}$ by the corresponding adjoint action. Then H is called *separable* if $\operatorname{Lie} C_G(H) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(H)$.

Note that we always have $\operatorname{Lie} C_G(H) \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(H)$. In [3], Bate et al. investigated the relationship between G-complete reducibility and separability, and showed the following [3, Thm. 1.2, Thm. 1.4] (see [9] for more on separability).

Proposition 1.5. *Suppose that p is very good for G. Then any subgroup of G is separable in G.*

Proposition 1.6. *Suppose that (G, M) is a reductive pair. Let H be a subgroup of M such that H is a separable subgroup of G. If H is G-cr, then it is also M-cr.*

Propositions 1.5 and 1.6 imply that the subgroup H in Theorem 1.2 must be non-separable, which is possible for small p only.

We recap our method from [22]. Fix a maximal torus T of $G = E_6$ (respectively E_7, E_8). Fix a system of positive roots. Let L be the A_5 (respectively A_6, A_7)-Levi subgroup of G containing T. Let P be the parabolic subgroup of G containing L, and let $R_u(P)$ be the unipotent radical of P. Let W_L be the Weyl group of L. Abusing the notation, we write W_L for the group generated by canonical representatives n_ζ of reflections in W_L. (See Section 2 for the definition of n_ζ.) Now W_L is a subgroup of L.

1. Find a subgroup K' of W_L acting non-separably on $R_u(P)$.
2. If K' is G-cr, set $K := K'$ and go to the next step. Otherwise, add an element t from the maximal torus T in such a way that $K := \langle K' \cup \{t\} \rangle$ is G-cr and K still acts non-separably on $R_u(P)$.
3. Choose a suitable element $v \in R_u(P)$ in a 1-dimensional curve C such that $T_1(C)$ is contained in $\mathfrak{c}_{\operatorname{Lie}(R_u(P))}(K)$ but not contained in $\operatorname{Lie}(C_{R_u(P)}(K))$. Set $H := vKv^{-1}$. Choose a connected reductive subgroup M of G containing H such that H is not G-cr. Show that H is not M-cr using Proposition 2.4.

As the first application of our construction, we consider a rationality problem for G-complete reducibility. We need a definition first.

Definition 1.7. Let k_0 be a subfield of k. Let H be a k_0-defined subgroup of a k_0-defined reductive algebraic group G. Then H is *G-completely reducible over k_0* (G-cr over k_0 for short) if whenever H is contained in a k_0-defined parabolic subgroup P of G, it is contained in some k_0-defined Levi subgroup of P.

Note that if k_0 is algebraically closed then G-cr over k_0 means G-cr in the usual sense. Here is the main result concerning rationality.

Theorem 1.8. *Let k_0 be a nonperfect field of characteristic 2, and let G be a k_0-defined split simple algebraic group of type $E_n (n = 6, 7, 8)$ of any isogeny type. Then there exists a k_0-defined subgroup H of G such that H is G-cr but not G-cr over k_0.*

Proof. Use the same $H = v(a)Kv(a)^{-1}$ as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 with $v := v(a)$ for $a \in k_0 \backslash k_0^2$. Then a similar method to [22, Sec. 4] shows that subgroups H have the desired properties. The crucial thing here is the existence of a 1-dimensional curve C such that $T_1(C)$ is contained in $\mathfrak{c}_{Lie(R_u(P))}(K)$ but not contained in $\mathrm{Lie}(C_{R_u(P)}(K))$ (see [22, Sec. 4] for details). □

Remark 1.9. Let k_0 and $G = E_6$ be as in Theorem 1.8. Based on the construction of the E_6 examples in this paper, we found the first examples of nonabelian k_0-defined subgroups H of G such that H is G-cr over k_0 but not G-cr; see [23]. Note that G-complete reducibility over k_0 is invariant under central isogenies [23, Sec. 2].

As the second application, we consider a problem concerning conjugacy classes. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let G act on G^n by simultaneous conjugation:

$$g \cdot (g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n) = (gg_1g^{-1}, gg_2g^{-1}, \ldots, gg_ng^{-1}).$$

In [18], Slodowy proved the following result, applying Richardson's tangent space argument [14, Sec. 3], [15, Lem. 3.1].

Proposition 1.10. *Let M be a reductive subgroup of a reductive algebraic group G defined over an algebraically closed field k. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(m_1, \ldots, m_N) \in M^N$ and let H be the subgroup of M generated by $m_1, \ldots, m_N$. Suppose that (G, M) is a reductive pair and that H is separable in G. Then the intersection $G \cdot (m_1, \ldots, m_N) \cap M^N$ is a finite union of M-conjugacy classes.*

Proposition 1.10 has many consequences; see [2], [18], and [24, Sec. 3] for example. Here is our main result on conjugacy classes:

Theorem 1.11. *Let G be a simple algebraic group of type E_6 (respectively E_7, E_8) defined over an algebraically closed k of characteristic $p = 2$. Let M be the subsystem subgroup of type A_5A_1 (respectively A_7, D_8). Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a tuple $\mathbf{m} \in M^N$ such that $G \cdot \mathbf{m} \cap M^N$ is an infinite union of M-conjugacy classes.*

Proof. We give a sketch with one example for $G = E_6$ (see Section 3, case 4). Keep the same notation P_λ, K', q_1, q_2 therein. Define $K_0 := \langle K', Z(R_u(P_\lambda))\rangle$. By a standard result, there exists a finite subset $F = \{z_1, \cdots, z_n\}$ of $Z(R_u(P_\lambda))$ such that $C_{P_\lambda}(\langle K' \cup F\rangle) = C_{R_u(P_\lambda)}(K_0)$. Let $\mathbf{m} := (q_1, q_2, z_1, \cdots, z_n)$. Set $N := n+2$. Then, a similar computation to that of [22, Sec. 5] shows that the tuple $\mathbf{m} \in M^N$ has the desired properties. The existence of a 1-dimensional curve C such that $T_1(C)$ is contained in $\mathfrak{c}_{Lie(R_u(P))}(K')$ but not contained in $\mathrm{Lie}(C_{R_u(P)}(K'))$ is crucial. □

Now we discuss another application of our construction with a different flavor. Here, we consider a question of Külshammer on representations of finite groups in reductive algebraic groups. Let Γ be a finite group. By a representation of Γ in a reductive algebraic group G, we mean a homomorphism from Γ to G. We write $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ for the set of representations ρ of Γ in G. The group G acts on $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ by conjugation. Let Γ_p be a Sylow p-subgroup of G. In [11, Sec. 2], Külshammer asked:

Question 1.12. Let G be a reductive algebraic group defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic p. Let $\rho_p \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$. Then are there only finitely many representations $\rho \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ such that $\rho\,|_{\Gamma_p}$ is G-conjugate to ρ_p?

In [1], Bate et al. presented an example where $p = 2, G = G_2$ and G has a finite subgroup Γ with Sylow 2-subgroup Γ_2 such that Γ has an infinite family of pairwise non-conjugate representations ρ whose restrictions to Γ_2 are all conjugate. In this paper, we present another example which answers Question 1.12 negatively:

Theorem 1.13. *Let G be a simple simply-connected algebraic group of type E_6 defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p = 2$. Then there exist a finite group Γ with a Sylow 2-subgroup Γ_2 and representations $\rho_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ for $a \in k$ such that ρ_a is not conjugate to ρ_b for $a \neq b$ but the restrictions $\rho_a\,|_{\Gamma_2}$ are pairwise conjugate for all $a \in k$.*

Note that the example of Theorem 1.13 is derived from Case 4 in the proof of Theorem 1.2. We also present an example giving a negative answer to Question 1.12 for a non-connected reductive G (this is much easier than the connected case):

Theorem 1.14. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 2. Let $G := SL_3(k) \rtimes \langle \sigma \rangle$ where σ is the nontrivial graph automorphism of $SL_3(k)$. Let $d \geq 3$ be odd. Let D_{2d} be the dihedral group of order $2d$. Let*

$$\Gamma := D_{2d} \times C_2 = \langle r, s, z \mid r^d = s^2 = z^2 = 1, srs^{-1} = r^{-1}, [r, z] = [s, z] = 1 \rangle.$$

Let $\Gamma_2 = \langle s, z \rangle$ (a Sylow 2-subgroup of Γ). Then there exist representations $\rho_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ for $a \in k$ such that ρ_a is not conjugate to ρ_b for $a \neq b$ but restrictions $\rho_a\,|_{\Gamma_2}$ are pairwise conjugate for all $a \in k$.

Here is the structure of this paper. In Section 2, we set out the notation and give a few preliminary results. Then in Section 3, 4, 5, we present a list of G-cr but non M-cr subgroups for $G = E_6, E_7, E_8$ respectively. This proves Theorem 1.2. Some details of our method will be explained in Section 3 using one of the examples for $G = E_6$. Finally in Section 6, we give proofs of Theorems 1.13 and 1.14.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout, we denote by k an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic p. Let G be an algebraic group defined over k. We write $R_u(G)$ for the *unipotent radical* of G, and G is called (possibly non-connected) *reductive* if $R_u(G) = \{1\}$. In particular, G is *simple* as an algebraic group if G is connected and all proper normal subgroups of G are finite. In this paper, when a subgroup H of G acts on G, we assume H acts on G by inner automorphisms. We write $C_G(H)$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(H)$ for the global and the infinitesimal centralizers of H in G and $\mathfrak{g}$ respectively. We write $X(G)$ and $Y(G)$ for the set of characters and cocharacters of G respectively.

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group. Fix a maximal torus T of G. Let $\Psi(G, T)$ denote the set of roots of G with respect to T. We sometimes write $\Psi(G)$ for $\Psi(G, T)$. Let

$\zeta \in \Psi(G)$. We write U_ζ for the corresponding root subgroup of G and $\mathfrak{u}_\zeta$ for the Lie algebra of U_ζ. We define $G_\zeta := \langle U_\zeta, U_{-\zeta} \rangle$. Let $\zeta, \xi \in \Psi(G)$. Let $\xi^\vee$ be the coroot corresponding to ξ. Then $\zeta \circ \xi^\vee : k^* \to k^*$ is a homomorphism such that $(\zeta \circ \xi^\vee)(a) = a^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We define $\langle \zeta, \xi^\vee \rangle := n$. Let s_ξ denote the reflection corresponding to ξ in the Weyl group of G. Each s_ξ acts on the set of roots $\Psi(G)$ by the following formula [19, Lem. 7.1.8]: $s_\xi \cdot \zeta = \zeta - \langle \zeta, \xi^\vee \rangle \xi$. By [6, Prop. 6.4.2, Lem. 7.2.1] we can choose homomorphisms $\epsilon_\zeta : k \to U_\zeta$ so that $n_\xi \epsilon_\zeta(a) n_\xi^{-1} = \epsilon_{s_\xi \cdot \zeta}(\pm a)$ where $n_\xi = \epsilon_\xi(1)\epsilon_{-\xi}(-1)\epsilon_\xi(1)$. We define $e_\zeta := \epsilon'_\zeta(0)$.

We recall [16, Sec. 2.1–2.3] for the characterization of a parabolic subgroup P of G, a Levi subgroup L of P, and the unipotent radical $R_u(P)$ of P in terms of a cocharacter of G and state a result from GIT (Proposition 2.4).

Definition 2.1. Let X be an affine variety. Let $\phi : k^* \to X$ be a morphism of algebraic varieties. We say that $\lim_{a \to 0} \phi(a)$ exists if there exists a morphism $\hat{\phi} : k \to X$ (necessarily unique) whose restriction to k^* is ϕ. If this limit exists, we set $\lim_{a \to 0} \phi(a) = \hat{\phi}(0)$.

Definition 2.2. Let λ be a cocharacter of G. Define $P_\lambda := \{g \in G \mid \lim_{a \to 0} \lambda(a) g \lambda(a)^{-1} \text{ exists}\}$, $L_\lambda := \{g \in G \mid \lim_{a \to 0} \lambda(a) g \lambda(a)^{-1} = g\}$, $R_u(P_\lambda) := \{g \in G \mid \lim_{a \to 0} \lambda(a) g \lambda(a)^{-1} = 1\}$.

Note that P_λ is a parabolic subgroup of G, L_λ is a Levi subgroup of P_λ, and $R_u(P_\lambda)$ is the unipotent radical of P_λ [16, Sec. 2.1-2.3]. By [19, Prop. 8.4.5], any parabolic subgroup P of G, any Levi subgroup L of P, and any unipotent radical $R_u(P)$ of P can be expressed in this form. It is well known that $L_\lambda = C_G(\lambda(k^*))$.

Let M be a reductive subgroup of G. There is a natural inclusion $Y(M) \subseteq Y(G)$ of cocharacter groups. Let $\lambda \in Y(M)$. We write $P_\lambda(G)$ or just P_λ for the parabolic subgroup of G corresponding to λ, and $P_\lambda(M)$ for the parabolic subgroup of M corresponding to λ. It is obvious that $P_\lambda(M) = P_\lambda(G) \cap M$ and $R_u(P_\lambda(M)) = R_u(P_\lambda(G)) \cap M$.

Definition 2.3. Let $\lambda \in Y(G)$. Define a map $c_\lambda : P_\lambda \to L_\lambda$ by $c_\lambda(g) := \lim_{a \to 0} \lambda(a) g \lambda(a)^{-1}$.

Note that the map c_λ is the usual canonical projection from P_λ to $L_\lambda \cong P_\lambda / R_u(P_\lambda)$. Now we state a result from GIT (see [2, Lem. 2.17, Thm. 3.1], [4, Thm. 3.3]).

Proposition 2.4. *Let H be a subgroup of G. Let λ be a cocharacter of G with $H \subseteq P_\lambda$. If H is G-cr, there exists $v \in R_u(P_\lambda)$ such that $c_\lambda(h) = vhv^{-1}$ for every $h \in H$.*

3 The E_6 examples

For the rest of the paper, we assume k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 2. Let G be a simple algebraic group of type E_6 defined over k. Without loss, we assume that G is simply-connected. Fix a maximal torus T of G. Pick a Borel subgroup B of G containing T. Let $\Sigma = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \sigma\}$ be the set of simple roots of G corresponding to B and T. The next figure defines how each simple root of G corresponds to each node in the Dynkin diagram of E_6. We label the positive roots of G as shown in Table 4 in the Appendix [7, Appendix, Table



B]. Define $L := \langle T, G_{22}, \cdots, G_{36} \rangle$, $P := \langle L, U_1, \cdots, U_{21} \rangle, W_L := \langle n_\alpha, n_\beta, n_\gamma, n_\delta, n_\epsilon \rangle$. Then P

is a parabolic subgroup of G, L is a Levi subgroup of P, and $\Psi(R_u(P)) = \{1, \cdots, 21\}$. Let $M = \langle L, G_{21} \rangle$. Then M is a subsystem subgroup of type A_5A_1, (G, M) is a reductive pair, and $\Psi(M) = \{\pm 21, \cdots, \pm 36\}$. Note that L is generated by T and all root subgroups with σ-weight 0, and M is generated by L and all root subgroups with σ-weight ± 2. Here, by the σ-weight of a root subgroup U_ζ, we mean the σ-coefficient of ζ.

Using Magma, we found that there are 56 subgroups of W_L up to conjugacy, and 11 of them act non-separably on $R_u(P)$. Table 1 lists these 11 subgroups K', and also gives the choice of t we use to give $K := \langle K' \cup \{t\} \rangle$. Note that $[L, L] = SL_6$ since G is simply-connected. We identify n_α, n_β, n_γ, n_δ, n_ϵ with (12), (23), (34), (45), (56) in S_6. To illustrate our method, we look at Case 4 closely.

case	generators of K'	$\lvert K' \rvert$	t	$v(a)$
1	(1 5)(2 3)(4 6)	2	$(\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)$
2	(1 5)(4 6), (1 4 5 6)(2 3)	4	$\alpha^\vee(b)$	$\epsilon_{10}(a)\epsilon_{13}(a)$
3	(2 4)(3 6), (1 5)(2 6)(3 4)	4	$(\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)$
4	(1 5)(2 3)(4 6), (1 4 2)(3 6 5)	6	$(\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)$
5	(1 5)(2 6)(3 4), (1 4 2)(3 6 5)	6	$(\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)$
6	(4 6), (1 4)(2 3)(5 6), (1 5)(4 6)	8	$\alpha^\vee(b)$	$\epsilon_{10}(a)\epsilon_{13}(a)$
7	(1 5)(2 6)(3 4), (2 4)(3 6), (1 2 4)(3 5 6)	12	$(\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)$
8	(1 4)(2 3)(5 6), (1 3 5)(2 4 6), (2 4 6)	18	$(\alpha^\vee + \beta^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_{11}(a)\epsilon_{12}(a)$
9	(1 4)(2 3)(5 6), (3 5)(4 6), (1 3 5), (2 4 6)	36	$(\alpha^\vee + \beta^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_{11}(a)\epsilon_{12}(a)$
10	(1 4 5 6)(2 3), (3 5)(4 6), (1 3 5), (2 4 6)	36	$(\alpha^\vee + \beta^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_{11}(a)\epsilon_{12}(a)$
11	(1 3), (1 4)(2 3)(5 6), (1 3)(4 6), (1 5 3), (2 6 4)	72	$(\alpha^\vee + \beta^\vee)(b)$	$\epsilon_{11}(a)\epsilon_{12}(a)$

Table 1: The E_6 examples

• Case 4:

Let $b \in k$ such that $b^3 = 1$ and $b \neq 1$. Define

$$q_1 := n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\epsilon,\ q_2 := n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\beta n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta,$$
$$t := (\alpha^\vee + \epsilon^\vee)(b),\ K' := \langle q_1, q_2 \rangle,\ K := \langle q_1, q_2, t \rangle.$$

It is easy to calculate how W_L acts on $\Psi(R_u(P))$. Let $\pi : W_L \to \mathrm{Sym}\,(\Psi(R_u(P))) \cong S_{21}$ be the corresponding homomorphism. Then we have

$$\pi(q_1) = (1\ 5\ 4)(2\ 3\ 6)(9\ 12\ 10)(11\ 13\ 14)(15\ 16\ 17)(18\ 20\ 19),$$
$$\pi(q_2) = (1\ 2)(3\ 4)(5\ 6)(7\ 8)(9\ 14)(10\ 11)(12\ 13)(15\ 18)(16\ 19)(17\ 20).$$

The orbits of $\langle q_1, q_2 \rangle$ are $O_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, $O_7 = \{7, 8\}$, $O_9 = \{9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}$, $O_{15} = \{15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20\}$, $O_{21} = \{21\}$. Since t acts trivially on $e_7 + e_8$, [22, Lem. 2.8] yields

Proposition 3.1. $e_7 + e_8 \in \mathfrak{c}_{\mathrm{Lie}(R_u(P))}(K)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $u \in C_{R_u(P_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\eta})}(K)$. Then u must have the form,*

$$u = \prod_{i=1}^{6} \epsilon_i(a) \prod_{i=7}^{8} \epsilon_i(b) \prod_{i=9}^{14} \epsilon_i(c) \left(\prod_{i=15}^{20} \epsilon_i(a+b+c) \right) \epsilon_{21}(a_{21}) \text{ for some } a, b, c, a_{21} \in k.$$

Proof. By [19, Prop. 8.2.1], u can be expressed uniquely as $u = \prod_{i=1}^{21} \epsilon_i(a_i)$ for some $a_i \in k$. Since $p = 2$ we have $n_\xi \epsilon_\zeta(a) n_\xi^{-1} = \epsilon_{s_\xi \cdot \zeta}(a)$ for any $a \in k$ and $\xi, \zeta \in \Psi(G)$. Then a calculation using the commutator relations ([10, Lem. 32.5, Lem. 33.3]) shows that

$$q_2 u q_2^{-1} = \epsilon_1(a_2)\epsilon_2(a_1)\epsilon_3(a_4)\epsilon_4(a_3)\epsilon_5(a_6)\epsilon_6(a_5)\epsilon_7(a_8)\epsilon_8(a_7)\epsilon_9(a_{14})\epsilon_{10}(a_{11})\epsilon_{11}(a_{10})\epsilon_{12}(a_{13})\epsilon_{13}(a_{12})$$
$$\epsilon_{14}(a_9)\epsilon_{15}(a_{18})\epsilon_{16}(a_{19})\epsilon_{17}(a_{20})\epsilon_{18}(a_{15})\epsilon_{19}(a_{16})\epsilon_{20}(a_{17})\epsilon_{21}(a_{18} + a_{21}). \quad (3.1)$$

Since q_1 and q_2 centralize u, we have $a_1 = \cdots = a_6,\ a_7 = a_8,\ a_9 = \cdots = a_{14},\ a_{15} = \cdots = a_{20}$. Set $a_1 = a,\ a_7 = b,\ a_9 = c,\ a_{15} = d$. Then (3.1) simplifies to

$$q_2 u q_2^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{6} \epsilon_i(a) \prod_{i=7}^{8} \epsilon_i(b) \prod_{i=9}^{14} \epsilon_i(c) \left(\prod_{i=15}^{20} \epsilon_i(d) \right) \epsilon_{21}(a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 + a_{21}).$$

Since q_2 centralizes u, comparing the arguments of the ϵ_{21} term on both sides, we must have

$$a_{21} = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 + a_{21},$$

which is equivalent to $a + b + c + d = 0$. Then we obtain the desired result. □

Proposition 3.3. *K acts non-separably on $R_u(P)$.*

Proof. Proposition 3.2 and a similar argument to that of the proof of [22, Prop. 3.3] show that $e_7 + e_8 \notin \operatorname{Lie} C_{R_u(P)}(K)$. Then Proposition 3.1 gives the desired result. □

Remark 3.4. The following three facts are essential for the argument above:

1. The orbit O_7 contains a pair of roots corresponding to a non-commuting pair of root subgroups which get swapped by q_2; $q_2 \cdot (\epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)) = \epsilon_8(a)\epsilon_7(a) = \epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)\epsilon_{21}(a^2)$.
2. The correction term $\epsilon_{21}(a^2)$ in the last equation is contained in $Z(R_u(P))$.
3. The root 21 corresponding to the correction term is fixed by $\pi(q_2)$.

Now, let $C := \left\{ \prod_{i=7}^{8} \epsilon_i(a) \mid a \in k \right\}$, pick any $a \in k^*$, and let $v(a) := \prod_{i=7}^{8} \epsilon_i(a)$. Now set $H := v(a) K v(a)^{-1} = \langle q_1, q_2\epsilon_{21}(a^2), t \rangle$. Note that $H \subset M, H \not\subset L$.

Proposition 3.5. *H is not M-cr.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \alpha^\vee + 2\beta^\vee + 3\gamma^\vee + 2\delta^\vee + \epsilon^\vee + 2\sigma^\vee$. Then $L = L_\lambda$, $P = P_\lambda$. Let $c_\lambda : P_\lambda \to L_\lambda$ be the homomorphism from Definition 2.3. In order to prove that H is not M-cr, by Proposition 2.4 it suffices to find a tuple $(h_1, h_2) \in H^2$ that is not $R_u(P_\lambda(M))$-conjugate to $c_\lambda((h_1, h_2))$. Set $h_1 := v(a) q_1 v(a)^{-1},\ h_2 := v(a) q_2 v(a)^{-1}$. Then

$$c_\lambda((h_1, h_2)) = \lim_{x \to 0} \left(\lambda(x) q_1 \lambda(x)^{-1},\ \lambda(x) q_2 \epsilon_{21}(a^2) \lambda(x)^{-1} \right) = (q_1, q_2).$$

Now suppose that (h_1, h_2) is $R_u(P_\lambda(M))$-conjugate to $c_\lambda((h_1, h_2))$. Then there exists $m \in R_u(P_\lambda(M))$ such that $mv(a) q_1 v(a)^{-1} m^{-1} = q_1$, $mv(a) q_2 v(a)^{-1} m^{-1} = q_2$. Thus we have $mv(a) \in C_{R_u(P_\lambda)}(K)$. Note that $\Psi(R_u(P_\lambda(M))) = \{21\}$. Let $m = \epsilon_{21}(a_{21})$ for some $a_{21} \in k$. Then we have $mv(a) = \epsilon_7(a)\epsilon_8(a)\epsilon_{21}(a_{21}) \in C_{R_u(P_\lambda)}(K)$. This contradicts Proposition 3.2. □

Proposition 3.6. *H is G-cr.*

Proof. Since H is G-conjugate to K, it is enough to show that K is G-cr. Since K is contained in L, by [17, Prop. 3.2] it suffices to show that K is L-cr. Then by [2, Lem. 2.12], it is enough to show that K is $[L, L]$-cr. Note that $[L, L] = SL_6$. An easy matrix computation shows that K acts semisimply on k^n, so K is G-cr by [17, Ex. 3.2.2(a)]. □

It is clear that similar arguments work for the other cases. We omit proofs.

4 The E_7 examples

Let G be a simple simply-connected algebraic group of type E_7 defined over k. Fix a maximal torus T of G, and a Borel subgroup of G containing T. We define the set of simple roots $\Sigma = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \eta, \sigma\}$ as in the following Dynkin diagram. The positive roots of G are listed in [7, Appendix, Table B].



Let L be the subgroup of G generated by T and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight 0. Let P be the subgroup of G generated by L and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight 1 or 2. Then P is a parabolic subgroup of G and L is a Levi subgroup of P. Let $W_L := \langle n_\alpha, n_\beta, n_\gamma, n_\delta, n_\epsilon, n_\eta \rangle$. Let M be the subgroup of G generated by L and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight ± 2. Then M is the subsystem subgroup of G of type A_7, and (G, M) is a reductive pair.

In the E_7 cases, we take $t = 1$ and $K' := K$; so each K is a subgroup of W_L. We use the same method as the E_6 examples, so we just give a sketch.

Using Magma, we found 95 non-trivial subgroups K of W_L up to conjugacy, and 19 of them are G-cr. Only two of them act non-separably on $R_u(P)$ (see Table 2). We determined G-complete reducibility and non-separability of K by a similar argument to that of the proof of Proposition 3.6. Note that $[L, L] = SL_7$. We identify $n_\alpha, \cdots, n_\eta$ with $(12), \cdots, (67)$ in S_7.

case	generators of K	$\lvert K \rvert$
1	(2 5)(3 7)(4 6), (1 4 3 2 5 7 6)	14
2	(2 6 7)(3 5 4), (2 5)(3 7)(4 6), (1 6 7 5 2 3 4)	42

Table 2: The E_7 examples

- Case 1 was in [22, Sec. 3].
- Case 2:

Let $q_1 = n_\epsilon n_\gamma n_\alpha, q_2 = n_\alpha n_\gamma n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta$, $K = \langle q_1, q_2 \rangle \cong \mathrm{Frob}_{42}$ (Frobenius group of order 42). We label some roots of G in Table 5 in Appendix. It can be calculated that K has an orbit $\{1, \cdots, 14\}$ which contains only one non-commuting pair of roots $\{2, 10\}$ contributing to a correction term that lies in U_{15}. Also, $\pi(q_1)$ swaps 2 with 10, and fixes 15. Thus K acts non-separably on $R_u(P)$ (see Remark 3.4). Now, set $v(a) = \prod_{i=1}^{14} \epsilon_i(a)$, and $H := v(a) \cdot K$. Then a similar argument to that of the proof of Proposition 3.5 show that H is not M-cr.

5 The E_8 examples

Let G be a simple simply-connected algebraic group of type E_8 defined over k. Fix a maximal torus T and a Borel subgroup B containing T. Define $\Sigma = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \eta, \xi, \sigma\}$ by the next Dynkin diagram. All roots of G are listed in [7, Appendix, Table B]. Let L be



the subgroup of G generated by T and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight 0. Let P be the subgroup of G generated by L and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight 1, 2, or 3. Let $W_L := \langle n_\alpha, n_\beta, n_\gamma, n_\delta, n_\epsilon, n_\eta, n_\xi \rangle$. Then P is a parabolic subgroup of G, and L is a Levi subgroup of P. Let M be the subgroup of G generated by L and all root subgroups of G with σ-weight ± 2. Then M is a subsystem subgroup of type D_8, and (G, M) is a reductive pair. In the E_8 cases, we take $t = 1$ and $K' := K$; so each K is a subgroup of W_L. We use the same method as in the E_6, E_7 examples, so we just give a sketch.

With Magma, we found 295 non-trivial subgroups K of W up to conjugacy, and 31 of them are G-cr. Only two of them act non-separably on $R_u(P)$ (see Table 3). Note that $[L, L] \cong SL_8$. We identify $n_\alpha, \cdots, n_\xi$ with $(12), \cdots, (78)$ in S_8.

case	generators of K	$\lvert K \rvert$
1	(2 6)(4 5)(7 8), (1 4 2 8 7 6 5)	14
2	(1 7 5)(2 6 8), (1 2)(5 8)(6 7), (1 2 7 5 4 8 6)	42

Table 3: The E_8 examples

• Case 1:

Let $q_1 = n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\delta n_\xi$, $q_2 = n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\beta n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\eta n_\xi n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\xi n_\eta n_\epsilon$, $K = \langle q_1, q_2 \rangle$.

We label some roots of G as in Table 6 in the Appendix. It can be calculated that K has an orbit $O_1 = \{1, \cdots, 7\}$ which contains only one non-commuting pair of roots $\{3, 4\}$, contributing a correction term that lies in U_8. Also $\pi(q_1)$ swaps 3 with 4, and fixes 8. So K acts nonseparably on $R_u(P)$ (see Remark 3.4). Now let $v(a) = \prod_{i=1}^{7} \epsilon_i(a)$, and define $H = v(a) \cdot K$. Then it is clear that H is not M-cr by the same argument as in the E_6 cases.

• Case 2:

Let $q_1 = n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\epsilon n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\eta n_\xi n_\eta$,
$q_2 = n_\alpha n_\epsilon n_\eta n_\xi n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\eta, q_3 = n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\epsilon n_\xi n_\eta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\eta n_\xi n_\eta, K = \langle q_1, q_2, q_3 \rangle$.

We label some roots of G as in Table 7 in Appendix. It can be calculated that K has an orbit $O_1 = \{1, \cdots, 14\}$ which contains only one non-commuting pair of roots $\{4, 9\}$ contributing a correction term that lies in U_{15}. Also $\pi(q_1)$ swaps 4 with 9, and fixes 15. Let $v(a) = \prod_{i=1}^{14} \epsilon_i(a)$ and define $H := v(a) \cdot K$. It is clear that the same arguments work as in the last case.

6 On a question of Külshammer for representations of finite groups in reductive groups

6.1 The E_6 example

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Let G be a simple simply-connected algebraic group of type E_6 defined over k. We keep the notation from Sections 2 and 3. Pick $c \in k$ such that $c^3 = 1$ and $c \neq 1$. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_1 :&= \alpha^\vee(c),\ t_2 := \beta^\vee(c),\ t_3 := \gamma^\vee(c),\ t_4 := \delta^\vee(c),\ t_5 := \epsilon^\vee(c),\\
q_1 :&= n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta n_\gamma n_\epsilon,\\
q_2 :&= n_\alpha n_\beta n_\gamma n_\delta n_\gamma n_\beta n_\alpha n_\beta n_\delta n_\epsilon n_\delta,\\
H' :&= \langle t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5, q_1, q_2 \rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that q_1 and q_2 here are the same as q_1 and q_2 in Case 4 of Section 3. Using Magma, we obtain the defining relations of H':

$$t_i^3 = 1,\ q_1^3 = 1,\ q_2^2 = 1,\ q_1 \cdot t_1 = (t_1t_2t_3)^{-1},\ q_1 \cdot t_2 = t_1t_2t_3t_4t_5,\ q_1 \cdot t_3 = (t_2t_3t_4t_5)^{-1},$$
$$q_1 \cdot t_4 = t_2,\ q_1 \cdot t_5 = t_3t_4,\ q_2 \cdot t_1 = (t_3t_4)^{-1},\ q_2 \cdot t_2 = t_2^{-1},\ q_2 \cdot t_3 = t_2t_3t_4t_5,$$
$$q_2 \cdot t_4 = (t_1t_2t_3t_4t_5)^{-1},\ q_2 \cdot t_5 = t_1t_2t_3,\ [t_i, t_j] = 1,\ (q_1^2q_2)^2 = 1.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma := F \times C_2 =\langle r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5, s_1, s_2, z \mid\ & r_i^3 = s_1^3 = 1, s_2^2 = 1, s_1r_1s_1^{-1} = (r_1r_2r_3)^{-1},\\ & s_1r_2s_1^{-1} = r_1r_2r_3r_4r_5, s_1r_3s_1^{-1} = (r_2r_3r_4r_5)^{-1}, s_1r_4s_1^{-1} = r_2, s_1r_5s_1^{-1} = r_3r_4,\\ & s_2r_1s_2^{-1} = (r_3r_4)^{-1}, s_2r_2s_2^{-1} = r_2^{-1}, s_2r_3s_2^{-1} = r_2r_3r_4r_5, s_2r_4s_2^{-1} = (r_1r_2r_3r_4r_5)^{-1},\\ & s_2r_5s_2^{-1} = r_1r_2r_3, [r_i, r_j] = (s_1^2s_2)^2 = [r_i, z] = [s_i, z] = 1\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Then $F \cong 3^{1+2} : 3^2 : S_3$ and $|F| = 1458 = 2 \times 3^6$. Let $\Gamma_2 := \langle s_2, z\rangle$ (a Sylow 2-subgroup of Γ). It is clear that $F \cong H'$.

For any $a \in k$ define $\rho_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ by

$$\rho_a(r_i) = t_i,\ \rho_a(s_1) = q_1,\ \rho_a(s_2) = q_2\epsilon_{21}(a),\ \rho_a(z) = \epsilon_{21}(1).$$

It is easily checked that this is well-defined.

Lemma 6.1. *$\rho_a|_{\Gamma_2}$ is G-conjugate to $\rho_b|_{\Gamma_2}$ for any $a, b \in k$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that $\rho_0|_{\Gamma_2}$ is G-conjugate to $\rho_a|_{\Gamma_2}$ for any $a \in k$. Now let

$$u(\sqrt{a}) = \epsilon_7(\sqrt{a})\epsilon_8(\sqrt{a}).$$

Then an easy computation shows that

$$u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot q_2 = q_2\epsilon_{21}(a),\ u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot \epsilon_{21}(1) = \epsilon_{21}(1).$$

So we have

$$u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot (\rho_0|_{\Gamma_2}) = \rho_a|_{\Gamma_2}.$$

□

Lemma 6.2. *ρ_a is not G-conjugate to ρ_b for $a \neq b$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in k$. Suppose that there exists $g \in G$ such that $g \cdot \rho_a = \rho_b$. Since $\rho_a(r_i) = t_i$, we need $g \in C_G(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5)$. A direct computation shows that $C_G(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5) = TG_{21}$. So let $g = tm$ for some $t \in T$ and $m \in G_{21}$. Note that q_2 centralizes G_{21}. So,

$$\begin{aligned}(tq_2t^{-1})(tm\epsilon_{21}(a)m^{-1}t^{-1}) &= (tm)q_2\epsilon_{21}(a)(m^{-1}t^{-1})\\ &= g \cdot \rho_a(s_2)\\ &= \rho_b(s_2)\\ &= q_2\epsilon_{21}(b). \qquad (6.1)\end{aligned}$$

Note that $tq_2t^{-1} \in G_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon}$ and $tm\epsilon_{21}(a)m^{-1}t^{-1} \in G_{21}$. Since $[G_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon}, G_{21}] = 1$, it is clear that $G_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon} \cap G_{21} = 1$. Now (6.1) yields that $tq_2t^{-1} = q_2$. We also have

$$q_1 = \rho_b(s_1) = g \cdot \rho_a(s_1) = tm \cdot q_1 = tq_1t^{-1}.$$

So t commutes with q_1 and q_2. Then a quick calculation shows that $t \in G_{21}$. So $g \in G_{21}$. But G_{21} is a simple group of type A_1, so the pair $(q_2\epsilon_{21}(a), \epsilon_{21}(1))$ is not G_{21}-conjugate to $(q_2\epsilon_{21}(b), \epsilon_{21}(1))$ if $a \neq b$. Therefore ρ_a is not G-conjugate to ρ_b if $a \neq b$. □

Now Theorem 1.13 follows from Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2. □

Remark 6.3. One can obtain examples with the same properties as in Theorem 1.13 for $G = E_7, E_8$ using the E_7 and E_8 examples in Sections 4 and 5.

6.2 The non-connected A_2 example

Proof of Theorem 1.14. We have $G^\circ = SL_3(k)$. Fix a maximal torus T of G°, and a Borel subgroup of G° containing T. Let $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ be the set of simple roots of G°. Let $c \in k$ such that $|c| = d$ is odd and $c \neq 1$. Define $t := (\alpha - \beta)^\vee(c)$. For each $a \in k$, define $\rho_a \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ by

$$\rho_a(r) = t,\ \rho_a(s) = \sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(a),\ \rho_a(z) = \epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1).$$

An easy computation shows that this is well-defined.

Lemma 6.4. *$\rho_a \mid_{\Gamma_2}$ is G-conjugate to $\rho_b \mid_{\Gamma_2}$ for any $a, b \in k$.*

Proof. Let $u(\sqrt{a}) := \epsilon_\alpha(\sqrt{a})\epsilon_\beta(\sqrt{a})$. Then

$$u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot \sigma = \sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(a),\ u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot \epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1) = \epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1).$$

This shows that $u(\sqrt{a}) \cdot (\rho_0 \mid_{\Gamma_2}) = \rho_a \mid_{\Gamma_2}$. □

Lemma 6.5. *ρ_a is not G-conjugate to ρ_b if $a \neq b$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in k$. Suppose that there exists $g \in G$ such that $g \cdot \rho_a = \rho_b$. Since $\rho_a(r) = t$, we have $g \in C_G(t) = TG_{\alpha+\beta}$. So let $g = hm$ for some $h \in T$ and $m \in G_{\alpha+\beta}$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}(h\sigma h^{-1})(hm\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(a)m^{-1}h^{-1}) &= (hm)\sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(a)(m^{-1}h^{-1}) \\ &= g \cdot \rho_a(s) \\ &= \rho_b(s) \\ &= \sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(b). \qquad (6.2)\end{aligned}$$

Now (6.2) shows that h commutes with σ. Then h is of the form $h := (\alpha + \beta)^\vee(x)$ for some $x \in k^*$. So $h \in G_{\alpha+\beta}$. Thus $g \in G_{\alpha+\beta}$. But $G_{\alpha+\beta}$ is a simple group of type A_1, so the pair $(\sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(a), \epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1))$ is not $G_{\alpha+\beta}$-conjugate to $(\sigma\epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(b), \epsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1))$ unless $a = b$. So ρ_a is not G-conjugate to ρ_b unless $a = b$. □

Theorem 1.14 follows from Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5. □

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by Marsden Grant UOA1021. The author would like to thank Ben Martin and Don Taylor for helpful discussions.

Appendix



Table 4: The set of positive roots of E_6



Table 5: Case 2 (E_7)



Table 6: Case 1 (E_8)



Table 7: Case 2 (E_8)

References

[1] M. Bate, B. Martin, and G. Röhrle. On a question of Külshammer for representations of finite groups in reductive groups. To appear in *Israel J. Math.*, arXiv:1505.00377v2, 2015.

[2] M. Bate, B. Martin, and G. Röhrle. A geometric approach to complete reducibility. *Invent. Math.*, 161:177–218, 2005.

[3] M. Bate, B. Martin, G. Röhrle, and R. Tange. Complete reducibility and separability. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 362(8):4283–4311, 2010.

[4] M. Bate, B. Martin, G. Röhrle, and R. Tange. Closed orbits and uniform S-instability in geometric invariant theory. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 365(7):3643–3673, 2013.

[5] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust. The Magma algebra system I: The user language. *J. Symb. Comp*, 24:235–265, 1997.

[6] R. Carter. *Simple Groups of Lie Type*. John Wiley & Sons, 1972.

[7] H. Freudenthal and H. de Vries. *Linear Algebraic Groups*. Academic Press, New York and London, 1969.

[8] O. Goodbourn. Reductive pairs arising from representations. arXiv:1412.8603v1, 2014.

[9] S. Herpel. On the smoothness of centralizers in reductive groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 365(7):3753–3774, 2013.

[10] J. Humphreys. *Linear Algebraic Groups*. Springer, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 1991.

[11] B. Külshammer. Donovan's conjecture, crossed products and algebraic group actions. *Israel J. Math.*, 92, 1995.

[12] M. Liebeck and G. Seitz. Reductive subgroups of exceptional algebraic groups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 580, 1996.

[13] M. Liebeck and D. Testerman. Irreducible subgroups of algebraic groups. *Q.J. Math*, 55:47–55, 2004.

[14] R. Richardson. Conjugacy classes in Lie algebras and algebraic groups. *Ann. of Math.*, 86:1–15, 1967.

[15] R. Richardson. On orbits of algebraic groups and Lie groups. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc*, 25(1):1–28, 1982.

[16] R. Richardson. Conjugacy classes of n-tuples in Lie algebras and algebraic groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 57:1–35, 1988.

[17] J.P. Serre. Complète Réductibilité. Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol 2003/2004. *Astérisque*, 299:195–217, 2005.

[18] P. Slodowy. *Two notes on a finiteness problem in the representation theory of finite groups,* Austral. Math. Soc. Lect. Ser. **9**, Algebraic groups and Lie groups, 331-348. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[19] T. Springer. *Linear Algebraic Groups*. Birkhäuser, Progress in Mathematics, second edition, 1998.

[20] D. Stewart. Non-G-completely reducible subgroups of the exceptional groups. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2014(22):6053–6078, 2014.

[21] A. Thomas. Simple irreducible subgroups of exceptional algebraic groups. *J. Algebra*, 423:190–238, 2015.

[22] T. Uchiyama. Separability and complete reducibility of subgroups of the Weyl group of a simple algebraic group of type E_7. *J. Algebra*, 422:357–372, 2015.

[23] T. Uchiyama. Complete reducibility of subgroups of reductive algebraic groups over non-perfect fields I. *J. Algebra*, 463:168–187, 2016.

[24] E. Vinberg. On invariants of a set of matrices. *J. Lie Theory*, 6:249–269, 1996.